

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7, 9,-11, 19-25, and 27 are in this application. Claims 3, 6, 8, 12-18 and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2 5 have been amended.

According to the Examiner, Claims 19-20, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This is respectfully traversed.

The subject matter of Claim 19 and 20 are methods of inhibiting TGF β 1 and AngII receptor converting enzyme. As can be seen from the experimental Example 3 that begins on page 59 of the specification, in particular table 5 B and D, it is clear that the present compounds do have the effect of decreasing TGF β 1 and Ang II serum level, and thus illustrate the activity of inhibiting TGF β 1 and AngII receptor converting enzyme.

According to page 2 of the Action the claims are enabled for cardio-vascular disease and tumors Therefore, it is assumed that the inclusion of Claims 22 and 25 in this rejection is an error as according to the Examiner Claims 22 and 25 are enabled.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as not being enabled. This is respectfully traversed.

It is applicants' position that Claims 6 and 26 are enabled, however, to expedite prosecution, Claim 6 and 26 are cancelled.

It is therefore, respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 19-27 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as not being enabled for the making of hydrates. This is respectfully traversed.

The specification includes examples of hydrates including Examples 8 (compound 2), 11(compound 19), 16 (compound 60), 23 (compound 32), 24 (compound 44), etc. all of which disclose hydrated final products (see element analysis), which are determined by H-NMR spectrums and elemental analysis. The compounds of the invention include those that are naturally present in the form of hydrates.

Therefore, since the specification includes description of how to prepare hydrates, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 USC §102(b)

According to the Examiner Claims 1-3, 10-11 and 27 are rejected as being anticipated by El-Kerdawy. This is respectfully traversed.

The pyrazole-derived substituents are deleted from Claim 1, thus the compounds of Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are not anticipated by El-Kerdawy.

It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

According to the Examiner Claims 1, 4, 10-11 and 27 are rejected as being anticipated by Levy et al.; Claims 1-2 and 4 as being anticipated by Bylov; Claims 1-2, 4, 10-11 and 27 as anticipated Ogiso; and Claims 1-2, 4, 10-11 and 27 as anticipated by Reusser.

These are respectfully traversed.

The definition of R₇ is amended to exclude hydrogen. Thus, these claims are not anticipated by Levy, et al; Bylov, et al; Ogiso, et al; and Reusser, et al as the compounds disclosed in the latter references are all unsubstituted coumarin except for the 3rd-position.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 USC §103

According to the Examiner Claims 1-3, 10-11 and 27 are rejected as being obvious over El-Kerdawy; Claims 1-4, 10-11 and 27 over Ukhov; and Claims 1-4 over Bylov. This is respectfully traversed.

Since none of the references, El-Kerdawy, et al; Ukhov, et al; Bylov, et al has ever disclosed a compound with substitution at the 7th-position, the claimed compounds are inventive over these references.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'JANET L. CORD', is written over a horizontal line.

JANET L. CORD
LADAS & PARRY LLP
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023
REG. NO. 33778 (212) 708-1935